the parties introduced in evidence and made a part of the record of this cause and of the proceedings before the Honorable M. S. Atwood, the stenographic commissioner duly appointed by this Court to take such evidence, and such stipulation duly appears in the record at Volume 35, Pages 6054-6059. The copy attached hereto is duly certified by H. Lawrence Hinkley, Deputy Attorney General of the State of Colorado, as being a true and accurate copy of such stipulation as executed and as contained in the files of the Attorney General of the State of Colorado.

2. Attached hereto as Exhibit B and submitted herewith is the affidavit of Charles L. Patterson, Chief Engineer of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, the agency of the State of Colorado charged with the protection of the water rights of the State of Colorado.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit C and submitted herewith is the affidavit of Gail L. Ireland, the Attorney General of the State of Colorado.

4. Attached hereto as Exhibit D and submitted herewith is a complete copy of the letter of January 5, 1940, referred to in paragraph numbered three of the affidavit of W. E. Stanley.

Respectfully submitted,

GAIL L. IRELAND,
Attorney General of the State of Colorado,
State Capitol,
Denver, Colorado,

A. W. MCHENDRIE,
Pueblo, Colorado,

HENRY C. VIDAL,
Equitable Bldg.,
Denver, Colorado,

ARTHUR C. GORDON,
Lamar, Colorado,

JEAN S. BREITENSTEIN,
Symes Bldg.,
Denver, Colorado,
Attorneys for Complainant.

EXHIBIT A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Original Case.

THE STATE OF COLORADO,

Complainant,

vs.

THE STATE OF KANSAS, and THE FINNEY COUNTY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION, a corporation,

Defendants.

STIPULATION.

THIS STIPULATION made and entered into this 18th day of December, 1933, by and between the State of Colorado, complainant herein, for and on its own behalf and on behalf of its citizens, its administrative officials and all ditch companies in the Arkansas River Basin, which are now or which may hereafter be diverting water from the flow of the Arkansas River, herein designated as first parties and complainant, and the State of Kansas on its own behalf and the Finney County Water Users Association, defendants herein, the State of Kansas acting on behalf of its citizens, its administrative officials and ditch companies, which are now or which may be hereafter diverting water from the flow of the Arkansas River.

WITNESSETH, That Whereas the above entitled case, now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, includes a controversy between the State of Kansas and the State of Colorado as to the division and the use of the water supply of the Arkansas River, and the final submission of the case to the Court and the entry of decree therein will not be practicable to be reached for sometime in the future, and

WHEREAS there is under consideration by and on behalf of the United States of America the question whether it shall construct a dam across the main channel of the Arkansas River near the town of Caddoa, Colorado, some fifty miles West from the Kansas-Colorado line, to create a water reservoir upon and near the Arkansas River by means of said dam, which reservoir will probably have a capacity of about 680,000 acre feet of water, and

WHEREAS it is thought by the parties hereto that the construction and maintenance of such dam and reservoir, in addition to regulating the flow of water in the Arkansas River in order to guard against or lessen the damage from floods, will enable much of the water that flows in said river past the location of said proposed dam to be stored, regulated and conserved for beneficial use, and

WHEREAS the parties hereto, their officials, ditch owners and water users, recognizing the advantages which will accrue from the construction of said dam and reservoir are willing to cooperate in attempting to bring about such construction by the United States Government if assured of the protection not only to all rights which they now have and which are involved in the present controversy, but also to their existing water supply in the event said dam should be constructed and put in operation prior to a decree being entered in the Supreme Court of the United States, adjudicating the respective rights of the parties hereto; and

WHEREAS it is desired to provide for the cooperation of the State of Kansas and the State of Colorado for the use of their influence towards obtaining the construction of such dam and the creation of such reservoir by the United States of America, and to provide, as far as the said two States may, by this Stipulation, for the allocation between the two States of the water which might

be stored in such reservoir, so far as such water can be made available for beneficial use in Colorado and Kansas;

And it is also desired to secure the cooperation of the defendant herein, The Finney County Water Users' Association, for all of the purposes covered by this Stipulation;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is stipulated and agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows:

1. Each of said States and also the said The Finney County Water Users' Association, will use its influence so far as it is practicable to obtain the construction by the United States of America of said dam and reservoir, and said parties agree as between themselves to the allocation of the water that might be stored in said reservoir, as hereinafter set forth; it being understood that such allocation shall be subject to the storage and discharge of water stored in such reservoir by the United States of America in order to lessen or avoid damages from floods.

2. That the construction and operation of said dam and reservoir shall not disturb the status quo of the diversion of water for beneficial uses from said Arkansas River by the ditches and canals now constructed and operated in both of the States of Colorado and Kansas. IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED that in order to maintain the status quo of said diversion as hereinabove referred to there shall be allocated to the State of Kansas for delivery at the State line in the Arkansas River from Colorado into Kansas a quantity of water up to 77,000 acre feet annually, of which amount 52,000 acre feet thereof shall be delivered to the State line during the irrigation season from April 1 to October 1 of each year as and when required by the Kansas State water officials, and 25,000 acre feet thereof to be delivered during the non-irrigating season from October 1 to April 1 at such times and in such amounts as same could be diverted and used for

irrigation or storage; and for irrigation of lands in Colorado below said reservoir a quantity of water up to 160,000 acre feet annually.

3. If the flow of water in the Arkansas River into the reservoir, and into the Arkansas River below the reservoir from other sources than the reservoir shall be insufficient to supply the total amount allocated as provided in paragraph 2 hereof; then in that event the said waters shall be prorated between Colorado and Kansas in the relation hereinabove in paragraph 2 hereof set forth.

4. After the allocation of water as provided in the next preceding paragraphs, all additional water which may be impounded in said reservoir, excepting, always the amounts of water discharged for flood control purposes, hereinafter referred to, shall constitute surplus and shall be allocated one-half to Colorado and one-half to Kansas, said surplus to be determined April 1, annually, or such other date as may be mutually agreed upon by water officials of the two States, and the amount allocated to each State shall be discharged from said reservoir from time to time on request of the Water Officials of each State respectively for the water allocated to it, but the release of such water on demand shall not be considered as constituting any part of the amounts specified in paragraph 2 herein.

5. All exchanges of water between the Colorado ditches whose headgates are below said reservoir and those whose headgates are above said reservoir shall be confined and limited to, and supplied from Colorado's portion of the surplus waters stored in said reservoir, as provided for in paragraph 4 hereof, and all such exchanges shall be charged against Colorado's share of the surplus in ascertaining the 50-50 division between the two states.

6. Any water releases from said reservoir for flood control or because of lack of reservoir capacity shall not be charged to either State unless such releases are coincident with the request for water on behalf of said State or the use and diversion by the ditches in such State, and then only to the extent of the request or use so made by it, in which event it shall be charged against the State so requesting or using the amount so requested or diverted.

7. The provisions in this Stipulation for allocation of flow of water shall become effective when such dam shall have been constructed and water begun to be stored in said reservoir.

8. This Stipulation is without prejudice to the claims of either party hereto in the above entitled case, and shall be subject to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States as to the respective rights of the parties hereto to water flowing in the Arkansas River, or stored in said reservoir.

9. That joint control, regulation and administration of the storage and discharge of all waters in said dam and reservoir shall be had by and between Kansas and Colorado.

10. This Stipulation shall not be filed in this action until the construction of said dam and reservoir by the United States Government shall be assured.

(Signed) PAUL P. PROSSER,
Attorney General of Colorado

(Signed) A. W. MCHENDRIE,
(Signed) HENRY C. VIDAL,
Solicitors for Complainant,

(Signed) ROLAND BOYNTON,
Attorney General of Kansas,

(Signed) JOHN G. EGAN,
(Signed) CHESTER I. LONG,
W. E. STANLEY,
(Signed) F. DUMONT SMITH,
Solicitors for Defendants.

Approved:

(Signed) ED C. JOHNSON,
Governor, State of Colorado,

(Signed) M. C. HINDERLIDER,
State Engineer of Colorado,

Approved:

(Signed) ALF M. LANDON,
Governor of Kansas,

(Signed) GEO. S. KNAPP,
Chief Division of Water Resources,
State of Kansas.

STATE OF COLORADO }
City and County of Denver } ss.

H. Lawrence Hinkley, being duly sworn upon oath deposes and says that he is the duly appointed, qualified and acting Deputy Attorney General of the State of Colorado;

That he has compared the foregoing stipulation with the original thereof, signed by the representatives of the parties and approved by the then Governor of the State of Kansas and the then Governor of the State of Colorado, which is in his custody as Deputy Attorney General of the State of Colorado, and that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete copy of said original stipulation.

Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

H. LAWRENCE HINKLEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires July 6, 1942.

ANN G. LANDY,
Notary Public.

The original of this affidavit is filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

EXHIBIT B

STATE OF COLORADO }
} ss.
City and County of Denver }

Charles L. Patterson, being first duly sworn, upon his oath, deposes and says:

That he is now and at all times since July 1, 1937, has been the duly appointed, qualified and acting Chief Engineer of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, the agency of the State of Colorado charged with the protection of the water resources of Colorado, and in his official capacity as such he has directed the engineering investigations made by the State concerning the Arkansas River and its tributaries, the interstate stream involved in this suit; that at all times since the filing of this case he has been familiar with the said interstate stream and with official records concerning its flow at various stations, and has participated in the preparation and presentation of much of the engineering testimony on behalf of the State of Colorado, and has appeared and testified on behalf of Colorado in the pending litigation; that prior to the filing of this case and at all times since about the year 1910 he has been acquainted with and has made investigations on the said interstate stream; that he has had knowledge of each of the several disputes between water users in Kansas and water users in Colorado; that he has read the answer of Defendants, the State of Kansas and The Finney County Water Users' Association, a corporation, to the motion of Complainant, the State of Colorado, for the appointment of a Special Master, and the affidavit of W. E. Stanley in support thereof, and he makes this affidavit for the purpose of presenting to the Court facts in connection with the pending controversy.

That on May 20, 1901, the State of Kansas filed a bill against the State of Colorado, and on August 17, 1903,

filed an amended bill naming as co-defendants the Graham Ditch Company and other corporations that had appropriated and were then diverting and using waters of the Arkansas River for irrigation purposes in Colorado, asserting, among other things, that the substantial interests of the State of Kansas, including the irrigation ditches in the western part of Kansas had sustained great and incalculable injury by reason of the appropriations, diversions and uses of waters of the Arkansas River in Colorado; that in its decision of May 13, 1907, the Court held that,

> "If the depletion of the waters of the river by Colorado continues to increase, there will come a time when Kansas may justly say that there is no longer an equitable division of benefits, and may rightfully call for relief against the action of Colorado, its corporations and citizens, in appropriating the waters of the Arkansas for Irrigation,"

and the Court dismissed the bill of the State of Kansas as against all defendants without prejudice to the rights of the State of Kansas,

> "to institute new proceedings whenever it shall appear that, through a material increase in the depletion of the waters of the Arkansas by Colorado, its corporations and citizens, the substantial interests of Kansas are being injured to the extent of destroying the equitable apportionment of benefits between the two States resulting from the flow of the river."

That subsequent to the decision of May 13, 1907, as above outlined, the State of Kansas, did not call for relief against the State of Colorado, its corporations or citizens, until it was required to answer the bill filed by the State of Colorado on leave granted January 3, 1928, and during the interval the State of Kansas failed and refused to be a party to litigation initiated by individual claimants in the State of Kansas as against appropriators and water users in the State of Colorado, as hereafter mentioned.

That on August 27, 1910, the case entitled, "The United States Irrigating Company v. The Graham Ditch Company, et al," was filed in the District Court of the United States, District of Colorado, being Case No. 5578, the object and purpose of which was to procure a decree establishing the claimed legal title by priority dates and amounts, regardless of state lines, of certain ditches in Western Kansas, as against the priorities and rights of the ditches and appropriators in Colorado awarded them by the Courts of the State of Colorado; that the said Case No. 5578 was settled by a contract dated February 19, 1916, under the terms of which the priorities of the Kansas ditches signatory thereto were recognized as of Date August 27, 1910, and wherein the Colorado appropriators agreed not to apply for or claim priorities for storage purposes on the Purgatoire River, or on the Arkansas River below the mouth of the Purgatoire River of earlier date, and agreed to pay the costs of said suit and also further sums of money to the signatory Kansas irrigation companies and irrigators; that the said payments were made and accepted, and the said priority dates have since been observed, no priorties for storage purposes having been applied for or claimed by the signatory Colorado ditches on the Purgatoire River or on the Arkansas River below the mouth of the Purgatoire River; that the owners of four of the five irrigating ditches in Kearney and Finney Counties in Kansas, and also the owners of the Lake McKinney Reservoir in Kearney County, Kansas, were parties to the said contract of February 19, 1916; that The Finney County Water Users' Association, owners of the Farmers Ditch in Finney County, Kansas, alone refused to become a party to the settlement contract of 1916, and thereafter in November, 1916 it filed a suit against the Graham Ditch Company and other irrigation companies in Colorado, being Case No. 6633, and later filed a second suit against the Coler Ditch and Reservoir Company and other appropriators and water users in Colorado, being

Case No. 7493, both in the District Court of the United States, District of Colorado, seeking to establish on the Arkansas River a system of interstate administration based on individual priorities regardless of state lines; that at the time the said Cases No. 6633 and No. 7493 were filed, and at all times since May 16, 1911 the said Finney County Water Users' Association has been obligated to deliver to the said ditches and reservoirs in Kearney and Finney Counties whose rights were determined and defined by the aforesaid agreement of February 19, 1916, 16/21st of all the divertible water supplies of the Arkansas River in said Counties in the State of Kansas, including such supplies as The Finney County Water Users' Association might acquire away from ditches in Colorado under decisions rendered in the said Cases No. 6633 and No. 7493.

That on leave granted January 3, 1928, the State of Colorado filed its pending bill, seeking to terminate the harassment to which its water users were subjected by the said suits of The Finney County Water Users' Association; that issues were joined in this case and this Court directed that evidence be taken before the Honorable M. S. Atwood, as stenographic commissioner; that thereafter such taking of evidence began and continued to the month of December, 1939.

That on or about the year 1933 an opportunity presented itself to secure the construction by the United States, Corps of Engineers, of a dam and reservoir on the Arkansas River near Caddoa, Colorado, to be located downstream from the mouth of the Purgatoire River, and at a point on the Arkansas River about 58 miles upstream from the Kansas-Colorado boundary line, the said reservoir having the combined purpose of flood control and water conservation; that representatives of the State of Kansas having threatened to protest against authorization of the said project and having threatened to enjoin its construction unless previously the rights of the State of

Kansas and its water users therein had been determined and defined, and in contemplation of the construction of said dam and reservoir, the two states entered into a stipulation, under date of December 18, 1933, copy of which is submitted herewith as Exhibit A.

That thereafter and by mutual consent, recognizing the uncertainties and delays incident to authorization, the securing of appropriations by the Congress, and the construction of the said Caddoa Dam and Reservoir, the name of which subsequently was changed to the John Martin Reservoir Project, testimony was submitted intermittently and only at intervals, and because of the said stipulation of 1933, no evidence was presented concerning stream flows, water supplies or irrigation needs subsequent to the year 1932, or concerning the additional supplies to be made available for irrigation uses by reason of the construction and operation of Caddoa Reservoir.

That the construction of the said Caddoa Dam and Reservoir and the appurtenant works was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1936; the first appropriation of funds for initial construction was included in the Flood Control Act of 1938; construction of the said Caddoa Dam is now under way and is partially completed, and funds and materials are available for some further construction, but are insufficient to complete the said reservoir to its designed capacity; that because of the recent war emergency, certain items of construction including the main flood control gates cannot be secured at this time, and as to when the said gates can be obtained so as to complete the said dam and reservoir there is some uncertainty; that in order to properly determine the relative rights of the two states, it is necessary that testimony be presented concerning Caddoa Reservoir and the effect of its ultimate and fractionally complete capacity upon the water supplies of the Arkansas River available and to be made available by the said project.

That the Complainant herein has not previously offered testimony or evidence as to the effect of the storage of water in the said Caddoa Reservoir upon the regimen of the stream flow because Complainant believed that the stipulation of 1933 conclusively determined the rights of the States of Colorado and Kansas and of the citizens and water users of the two states in and to the irrigation benefits of the said Caddoa Reservoir and in and to the water supplies to be made available for additional irrigation uses by the said project; that representatives of the Defendants have asserted and now continue to assert that the said stipulation of 1933 is merely an interim agreement to be effective only until a decree is entered by the United States Supreme Court in this case; that while the State of Colorado does not acquiesce in nor agree with the position taken by representatives of the Defendants, it believes that in order to expedite the matter and to have all the facts before the Court, it is necessary that evidence be presented as to the effect which the storage of water in the said Caddoa Reservoir will have upon the regimen of the stream flow of the Arkansas River and upon the water supplies of said river that are or may become available for irrigation use; and that because the said Caddoa Reservoir is not yet completed and has not been placed in operation as contemplated by the stipulation of 1933 and because its operation will materially affect the water supplies of the Arkansas River available for irrigation purposes, it is necessary to a proper determination of the rights of the parties hereto, that evidence as to the effect of such storage of water in the said Caddoa Reservoir be presented in this case.

That beginning about January, 1940, the parties hereto entered negotiations for a settlement of the interstate controversy involved in this suit; that such negotiations were not hurried, for the reason that the anticipated date of completion of the said Caddoa Dam and Reservoir would not have arrived, had it not been further deferred by

the war emergency, until late in the year 1942 or early in the year 1943; that not until recently did it become apparent to Complainant that an amicable adjustment was not to be reached, because of the Defendants claiming such a large share of all the water resources of the Arkansas River in Colorado that, to satisfy such claims, there would be required some of the waters which this Court by its decree of 1907 found and determined to have been appropriated, diverted and used, and to come within Colorado's equitable share of the total of the said interstate stream, and in addition thereto would require all of the surplus water supplies to become available for additional irrigation use when Caddoa Dam and Reservoir is completed to its full capacity, thus nullifying the provisions of the stipulation of 1933.

That as a result of the failure of the parties to reach an agreement for the settlement of the pending controversy, it becomes necessary to have the same determined by the Court; that promptly, when the necessity for such procedure appeared, the Complainant at once negotiated with representatives of Defendants for a joint application to the Court for directions as to further procedure; and that upon refusal of representatives of Kansas to agree to any application contemplating the taking of further testimony, the State of Colorado then filed herein its motion for the appointment of a Special Master.

That the preparation and presentation of such further evidence concerning stream flows and water supplies, as affected by the recent cycle of drouth seasons, and as they may be affected by the operation of the said Caddoa Reservoir, can be accomplished in a reasonably short time, probably by the time the Master has acquainted himself with the testimony heretofore presented, and will, therefore, occasion no unreasonable delay nor impose any material expense on the Defendants.

That in the year 1907, a stream gaging station was established on the Arkansas River near the boundary line between the States of Colorado and Kansas, which station has since been maintained by the State of Colorado in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey, and at which the quantities of water flowing from Colorado into Kansas have been recorded; that while said quantities are variable from year to year, month to month, and day to day in accordance with variable and intermittent amounts of natural precipitation, when considered as averages over a series of years the said quantities have been as large during recent years, and during the summer months of the irrigation seasons of recent years, as prevailed at the time of and immediately following the decision of 1907; that by reason of insufficient diversion and storage capacities along the Arkansas River in Western Kansas, a major share of the said state line flows, considered as long-time averages, are undiverted and unused in the State of Kansas.

Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

CHARLES L. PATTERSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires July 6, 1942.

ANN G. LANDY,
Notary Public.

The original of this affidavit is filed with the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court.

EXHIBIT C

STATE OF COLORADO }
} ss.
City and County of Denver }

Gail L. Ireland, being first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says that he is the duly elected, qualified and acting Attorney General of the State of Colorado, and in his official capacity and by the direction of the Honorable Ralph L. Carr, Governor of the State of Colorado, he represents the State of Colorado in this case;

That he has read the answer of Defendants, State of Kansas, and The Finney County Water Users' Association, a corporation, to the motion of Complainant for appointment of a Special Master, and the affidavit of W. E. Stanley filed in support thereof;

That the statement in said answer that "the request for taking additional testimony has been interposed to effect further delay and to prevent these Defendants from having a determination of the issues involved in this suit" is not true; that such request has been presented solely for the purpose of having before the Court all pertinent testimony necessary for a proper determination of this controversy;

That the State of Colorado has no desire to and does not intend to do anything to protract the taking of testimony to the prejudice of the rights of the Defendants; that the State of Colorado agrees that a speedy determination of this cause is desirable but the State of Colorado believes that for the serious and long-standing controversy between these litigants to be finally settled it is necessary that the Court have before it at the time of its decision all pertinent evidence and thereby prevent a determination which might result in further misunderstandings and litigation between the parties hereto;

That the negotiations for settlement of this case begun on or about January, 1940 were in good faith and not for delay so far as the State of Colorado is concerned, and that the State of Colorado considered that through such negotiations a settlement of this controversy might be reached earlier than possible through court decision, and that the State of Colorado earnestly, patiently, and assiduously carried on such negotiations with the hope and expectation of making such settlement, and that upon the termination of such negotiations the State of Colorado promptly presented to this Court its motion for the appointment of a Special Master;

That since May, 1941, when he began to actively participate in this case the major topic of discussion at the conferences held for the purpose of negotiating a consent decree was the effect that the construction, operation and use of Caddoa Reservoir would have upon the available water supply of said reservoir and the applying of said water to a more economical and widespread beneficial use;

That submitted herewith and marked Exhibit D is a true, accurate and complete copy of that certain letter dated January 5, 1940 and referred to in paragraph numbered three of the affidavit of W. E. Stanley.

Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

GAIL L. IRELAND.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of April, A. D. 1942.

Witness my hand and official seal.

My commission expires July 6, 1942.

ANN G. LANDY,
Notary Public.

The original of this affidavit is filed with the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court.

EXHIBIT D

OFFICES

HODGES, VIDAL & GOREE
EQUITABLE BUILDING
DENVER, COLORADO

January 5, 1940.

Mr. W. E. Stanley,
First National Bank Building,
Wichita, Kansas.

Dear Mr. Stanley:

Re: *Colorado* v. *Kansas*

With reference to your suggestion that since the taking of testimony in the above case has been completed we should arrange a program as to further procedure therein, we have conferred with the Colorado officials and our engineering associates, and beg leave to submit the following suggestions:

Since the construction of the Caddoa Reservoir now seems to be assured and the stipulation of 1933 has been filed in the case, we feel that there is presented a sound and practical opportunity for the allocation and distribution of the waters of the Arkansas River between the states of Colorado and Kansas to the mutual benefit of the water users of those two states.

We believe that the many problems involved in this long drawn-out and expensive legal controversy can, and should, be solved to the best interest of both states and the water users thereof by a conference between the representatives of each state, at which conference a fair and earnest effort should be made to arrive at the terms of a consent decree which may be entered in the Supreme Court.

All the pertinent facts material to this controversy have been exhaustively developed and are now in the record, and while we may differ as to the interpretation and construction of some of those facts, nevertheless, we should be able to arrive at a more reasonable and equitable judgment than would probably be possible for any court to reach, in the face of the extraordinarily lengthy record with which it will be confronted.

We, therefore, suggest that before we adopt any definite plan or program which would incur further expense and entail an immense amount of labor, we should at least make an honest and earnest effort to see if we cannot reach an agreement as to such a consent decree. To that end, we suggest that the Governors, Attorneys General, Engineers and Counsel of the respective states get together "around the table" at a conference, to be held at some convenient place in the near future, and see if we cannot agree upon the judgment to be entered in this matter.

We are authorized to say that the Governor and Attorney General of Colorado are heartily in accord with this suggestion, and will be glad to contribute whatever time and effort that may be deemed advisable to bring about this end.

The conspicuous success which attended the adjustment of the Rio Grande River controversy between Colorado, New Mexico and Texas by this method; and the adjustment of the serious and long drawn-out controversy between the seven states affected by the Colorado River

Compact; by means of a series of such conferences, leads us to believe that more can be attained in this way than by continued litigation.

We shall be pleased to have your reaction to this suggestion at your early convenience.

Yours very truly,
HENRY C. VIDAL,
A. W. MCHENDRIE.

HCV/f

CC: HON. RALPH L. CARR,
Governor of Colorado,
Denver, Colorado,

HON. JAY S. PARKER,
Attorney General,
Topeka, Kansas,

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS,
Attorney General,
Denver, Colorado.